

Hidden variable models for quantum mechanics can have local parts

Jan-Åke Larsson^{1,*} and Adán Cabello^{2,†}

¹*Institutionen för Systemteknik och Matematiska Institutionen,
Linköpings Universitet, SE-581 83 Linköping, Sweden*

²*Departamento de Física Aplicada II, Universidad de Sevilla, E-41012 Sevilla, Spain*
(Dated: December 30, 2009)

We criticize Colbeck and Renner’s (CR’s) statement that “any hidden variable model can only be compatible with quantum mechanics if its local part is trivial” [Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 050403 (2008)]. We note that CR’s attempt to divide a nonlocal hidden variable model into a “local part” and a “nonlocal part” contains a restriction on the latter. This restriction implies that the division is really into a “local part” and a “nonsignaling nonlocal part.” CR’s nonsignaling requirement on the “nonlocal part” cannot be physically motivated, since the hidden variables cannot be accessed by experimenters. Nor is it a natural mathematical generalization from the local hidden variable case, since it is simple to make a generalization without CR’s requirement. We give an explicit nonlocal hidden variable model that, in the case the restriction is not enforced, contains nontrivial local hidden variables.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Mn, 42.50.Xa

Introduction.—If quantum mechanics is correct but not complete [1], a fundamental question is which classes of more detailed theories are compatible with it. Experimental violations of Bell inequalities [2, 3, 4, 5] suggest, and a loophole-free violation would confirm (see [6] for a proposal), that local hidden variable (HV) models [7, 8] are not an alternative. Loophole-free experimental violations of noncontextual inequalities [4, 5, 9] already prohibit noncontextual HV models [10, 11, 12, 13].

Recently, considerable experimental effort [14, 15, 16] has been devoted to testing the violation of an inequality proposed by Leggett [17] and a different inequality proposed by Branciard *et al.* [15], valid for specific classes of nonlocal HV models. These experiments suggest that these models are not an alternative either. Another example is an early theoretic study [18], on nonlocal HV models that consist of a statistical mixture of a local and a nonlocal ensemble, in which case the local ensemble must have probability zero.

More recently, Colbeck and Renner (CR) have made a much more profound and far-reaching claim. According to CR, “any hidden variable model can only be compatible with quantum mechanics if its local part is trivial” [19]. Several experiments in progress are currently testing the violation of an inequality that CR propose.

The present paper studies CR’s formal result in detail, and focuses on the fact that CR’s division into “local part” and “nonlocal part” contains a nonsignaling restriction on the “nonlocal part.” The proof that the “local part” is trivial in [19] only holds under this restriction on the nonlocal part. We scrutinize the weaknesses of the physical and mathematical motivation for this restriction. We also study the effects of the restriction in an explicit nonlocal HV model; local HVs contained in the model are forced to belong to the “nonlocal part” to prohibit signaling in the “nonlocal part.” From the lack of physical motivation for the nonsignaling requirement,

and the fact that it is imposed on the “nonlocal part” rather than the “local part,” we conclude that it should not be used, and thus, that nonlocal HV models can have nontrivial local parts.

We will use the scenario of Bell [7] and the notation of CR’s Letter [19]. Consider two particles which travel to two far apart locations, Alice’s and Bob’s, where a local measurement is made on each particle. The setting a (b) pertains to the local measurement A (B) at Alice’s (Bob’s) location and the corresponding outcome is denoted X (Y). The nonlocal HV Γ can be divided into a “local part” at the first site U , a “local part” at the second site V , and a nonlocal part W . The distribution of Γ is not specified in Ref. [19], but it appears [20] that the requirement is

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\Gamma|ab}(\gamma) &= P_{UVW|ab}(u, v, w) \\ &= P_{W|abuv}(w)P_{UV}(u, v), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

and in the case that W is trivial, the reader will recognize Eq. (1) above as the usual requirement on the distribution of local HVs.

The probability distribution of the outcomes X and Y is then determined by the values of these variables and is denoted $P_{X|abuv}$ and $P_{Y|abuv}$. Now, CR proceed to “ignore” the nonlocal part W and require that the HV model obeys (see Eq. (2) in Ref. [19])

$$\begin{aligned} P_{X|abuv} &= P_{X|au}, \\ P_{Y|abuv} &= P_{Y|bv}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The reader will again seem to recognize the usual requirement on a local HV model; that the local outcome cannot depend on the remote setting [usually there is only one local HV $\lambda = u = v$, but the present formulation is equivalent in the case that $X = Y$ whenever $a = b$, i.e., given existence of EPR elements of reality]. However, if you do

not “ignore” the nonlocal part W , you obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P_{X|abuv} &= P_{X|auw}, \\ P_{Y|abuv} &= P_{Y|bvw}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

We would argue that this is the correct generalization of requirement (2) to the nonlocal HV case: The local outcome may depend on the HVs, and the local setting of the measurement apparatus, but not the remote setting. Evidently, if W is trivial, the expressions (3) reduce to that in (2). If W is nontrivial, averaging over it will remove dependence of w from the expressions (and this appears to be what CR do “when ignoring” W). Under requirement (3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P_{X|abuv} &= \sum_w P_{W|abuv}(w) P_{X|abuvw} \\ &= \sum_w P_{W|abuv}(w) P_{X|auw} = P_{X|abu}, \\ P_{Y|abuv} &= \sum_w P_{W|abuv}(w) P_{Y|abuvw} \\ &= \sum_w P_{W|abuv}(w) P_{Y|bvw} = P_{Y|abv}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

That is, even if (3) holds, the dependence of the remote measurement setting remains, mediated through the nonlocal HV W . This in itself is not strange, but means that requiring (2) enforces *an additional restriction* on the HV model. This is described by CR in [19] as follows:

In particular, knowing the value of the local hidden variables would not permit signaling between Alice and Bob.

We would argue that this in fact is an explicit extra requirement, not on the “local part” U and V , but on the “nonlocal part” W . Comparing requirement (2) with the usual non-signaling requirement

$$\begin{aligned} P_{X|ab} &= P_{X|a}, \\ P_{Y|ab} &= P_{Y|b}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

it is clear that (2) should be read: “For each value of u and v , the remaining HV model should be nonsignaling.” We do not agree with CR that this is necessary; but we do agree with CR [19] that “... signaling may be possible given knowledge of the nonlocal variable W .” In fact, we would go further and say that signaling is *only* possible through the nonlocal variable W . Indeed, given the value of the nonlocal HV, no dependence on the remote setting remains for the local outcome. This is the requirement that should be used, and it is exactly Eq. (3) expressed in words. Thus, Eq. (3) is the natural requirement, and not the requirement (2) [that the “nonlocal part” should be nonsignaling given the value of the “local part” HVs].

There is another more direct implication from CR’s restriction (2): The nonlocal HV model must be nonsignaling. This is simple to see, since the restriction (2) directly

implies, for example

$$\begin{aligned} P_{X|ab} &= \sum_{u,v} P_{UV}(u,v) P_{X|abuv} \\ &= \sum_{u,v} P_{UV}(u,v) P_{X|au} = P_{X|a}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

This may seem like an innocuous implication; we only want to study nonsignaling models in any case. However, clearly a nonlocal model can be signaling and therefore cannot in general obey Eq. (6) nor Eq. (2). Thus, the claim in [19] “that identities (2) do not restrict the generality of the hidden variable model” is incorrect.

What’s wrong with CR’s restriction on a nonlocal HV model?— Using CR’s restriction (2) we will find that explicitly local HVs within a HV model [that obeys (3)] must belong to the “nonlocal part” to mask out the signaling properties of the “nonlocal part.”

Let $U = V$ be uniformly distributed between 0 and 2π , $W = A$, and let the outcome probabilities be given by

$$\begin{aligned} P_{X|abuvw}(+1) &= P_{X|au}(+1) = \begin{cases} 1, & a < u < a + \pi, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \\ P_{Y|abuvw}(-1) &= P_{Y|bvw}(-1) \\ &= \begin{cases} 1, & w + \pi \sin^2(b - w) < v \\ & < w + \pi \sin^2(b - w) + \pi, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

This gives the quantum predictions from the singlet state (see below).

The nonlocal HV W only carries information about Alice’s measurement setting, and is independent of the local HVs. There can be no doubt that U and V are local HVs; their distributions do not depend on a , b , or the value w of W ; and the outcomes depend only on the local setting and the HVs that are available at each site, so that (3) is fulfilled. Indeed, U also fulfils CR’s definition of local part, (2). Remarkably, even so, U belongs to CR’s “nonlocal part,” but to see this we need to take a complicated route. We first must verify that V , in spite of being a local HV as noted above, belongs to CR’s “nonlocal part” by taking the average of $P_{Y|bvw}$ over W (here, using an integral rather than a sum, and $p_{W|abuv}(w) = \delta(w - a)$),

$$\begin{aligned} P_{Y|abuv}(-1) &= \int_w p_{W|abuv}(w) P_{Y|bvw}(-1) dw \\ &= \begin{cases} 1, & a + \pi \sin^2\left(\frac{b-a}{2}\right) < v \\ & < a + \pi \sin^2\left(\frac{b-a}{2}\right) + \pi, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

This average depends on a , and this is a direct consequence of the fact that the distribution of W depends

on a . This does not fulfill Eq. (2), so CR's restriction forces the conclusion that V belongs to the “nonlocal part” in spite of having a local distribution. And this means that we need to average over the new “nonlocal part” $W' = (V, W)$ to find out whether U belongs to the “local part,”

$$P_{Y|abu}(-1) = \iint_{vw} p_V(v) p_{W|abuv}(w) P_{Y|bvw}(-1) dw dv$$

$$= \begin{cases} 1, & a + \pi \sin^2\left(\frac{b-a}{2}\right) < u \\ & < a + \pi \sin^2\left(\frac{b-a}{2}\right) + \pi, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

And this depends on a as well as u [the remote setting and HV]. The local HVs U and V thus both belong to the “nonlocal part.”

For completeness, we use the above expressions to determine the joint outcome probabilities and find, for example,

$$P_{XY|ab}(+1, +1) = \frac{[a + \pi \sin^2\left(\frac{b-a}{2}\right)] - a}{2\pi} \quad (10)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sin^2\left(\frac{b-a}{2}\right),$$

as desired.

The “local part” in CR's sense is trivial, not because of lack of local HVs, but because all of the the local HVs are drawn into the “nonlocal part” by CR's extra requirement.

Conclusions.— Specific classes of nonlocal HV models have been studied in a number of papers. These classes are all restricted in one way or another, which for example is simple to see in [18]. Also, Aspect [21] and De Zela [22] have pointed out that there are nonlocal HV models that are not addressed by Leggett's inequality. The apparent strength of CR's result was precisely that it seems to lead to a more general statement: the possibility of an experimental refutation of any HV model with a nontrivial local part.

However, we have here shown that CR's division of nonlocal HVs into “local part” and “nonlocal part” carries an extra nonsignaling restriction on the “nonlocal part” that is not physically nor mathematically motivated. This extra requirement makes the claim “any hidden variable model can only be compatible with quantum mechanics if its local part is trivial” [19] unfounded. The

statement should instead be: Any HV model that splits into a “local part” and a *nonsignaling* “nonlocal part” can only be compatible with quantum mechanics if its “local part” is trivial. Furthermore, a trivial “local part” does not mean that the model lacks local HVs, only that all HVs (even local ones) are forced into the “nonlocal part,” to prevent signaling within the “nonlocal part.” We can only conclude that no startling conclusions can be drawn from the split into “local” and “nonlocal parts” proposed in [19].

The authors thank M. Bourennane, R. Colbeck, R. Renner, and H. Weinfurter for discussions. A.C. acknowledges support from the Spanish MEC Project No. FIS2005-07689, and the Junta de Andalucía Excellence Project No. P06-FQM-02243.

* Electronic address: jalar@mai.liu.se

† Electronic address: adan@us.es

- [1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935).
- [2] A. Aspect, J. Dalibard, and G. Roger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 1804 (1982).
- [3] G. Weihs *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5039 (1998).
- [4] M. A. Rowe *et al.*, Nature (London) **409**, 791 (2001).
- [5] D. N. Matsukevich *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 150404 (2008).
- [6] W. Rosenfeld *et al.*, Adv. Sci. Lett. **2**, 469 (2009).
- [7] J. S. Bell, Physics (Long Island City, NY) **1**, 195 (1964).
- [8] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 880 (1969).
- [9] G. Kirchmair *et al.*, Nature (London) **460**, 494 (2009).
- [10] E. Specker, Dialectica **14**, 239 (1960).
- [11] J. S. Bell, Rev. Mod. Phys. **38**, 447 (1966).
- [12] S. Kochen and E. P. Specker, J. Math. Mech. **17**, 59 (1967).
- [13] A. Cabello, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 210401 (2008).
- [14] S. Gröblacher *et al.*, Nature (London) **446**, 871 (2007); *ibid.* **449**, 252 (2007).
- [15] C. Branciard *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 210407 (2007).
- [16] C. Branciard *et al.*, Nat. Phys. **4**, 681 (2008).
- [17] A. J. Leggett, Found. Phys. **33**, 1469 (2003).
- [18] A. C. Elitzur, S. Popescu and D. Rorlich Phys. Lett. A **162**, 25 (1992).
- [19] R. Colbeck and R. Renner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 050403 (2008).
- [20] R. Colbeck and R. Renner (private communication).
- [21] A. Aspect, Nature (London) **446**, 866 (2007).
- [22] F. De Zela, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **41**, 505301 (2008).